

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| 09/805,722 | 03/12/2001 | Brian Henry Stockley | EL727968517US | EL727968517US 3163 EXAMINER | |
| 75 | 90 11/18/2003 | | EXAM | | |
| Siemens Corporation | | | THAI, HANH B | | |
| Intellectual Property Department 186 Wood Avenue South | | | ART UNIT PAPER NUM | | |
| Iselin, NJ 08930 | | , | 2171 | 2171 DATE MAILED: 11/18/2003 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 11/18/2003 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| •1 • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/805,722 | STOCKLEY, BRIAN | HENRY | | | |
| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Hanh B Thai | 2171 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 11/6/03 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearamentation (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | void abandonment of this applice it is applicated and the same it | cation. A proper rep ch places the applic | cation in | | | |
| PERIOD FOR RE | PLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of | • | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions. | an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 | the final rejection. FINAL REJECTION. S 36(a) and the appropriate | e extension fee | | | |
| 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | statutory period for reply originally set in inthis after the mailing date of the final reje | the final Office action; or action, even if timely filed, | (2) as set forth in | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | | • | | | |
| (a) X they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (| see NOTE below); | | | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | |
| (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without cancel | ing a corresponding number of | finally rejected clair | ns. | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | tion(s): | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a s | eparate, timely filed | d amendment | | | |
| 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request fo application in condition for allowance because: | r reconsideration has been cons | sidered but does NC | OT place the | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | cause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which we | re newly | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | | and an | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | • • | ••• | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-23</u> . | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app | roved or b) disapproved by | the Examiner. | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme | | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | 180 | | | |
| | | ν | | | | |

3)

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 09/805,722

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Porposed amendment with respect to claims 1, 5,10, 11 and 20 have changed the scope of the claims. Furthermore, applicant argues, Bolnick et al. do not disclose "...subsystem of an electronics assembly system engineering system". As mentioned in the previous action and the final action, the bodies of the claims have no connection to "electronics assembly engineering system". Therefore, this element has no patentable weight as noted in the previous office actions. And applicant argues, Bolnick et al. do not teach or suggest "... 'save-as' function for data structure". The examiner respectfully points out that the "save-as function" is used as an option so that it can be operated, applied and included or not to the data structure. Furthermore, Bolnick discloses a Microsoft Layout Editor including a save-as function (see col. 17, lines 12-20, Bolnick) as noted in the final action.